DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 734 HE 014 421

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Rodgers, R. Scott; Sedlacek, William E. |
| TITLE | Racial Attitudes of White University Freshmen by Sex. |
| INSTITUTION | Maryland Univ., College Park. Counseling Center. |
| REPORT NO | UM-CC-RR-9-79 |
| PUB DATE | 79 |
| NOTE | 20p.; For related documents see HE 014 420, and HE 014 424. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | University of Maryland, Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Counseling Center, College Park, MD 20742 ($1.50). |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC01 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Attitude Change; Blacks; *College Environment; *College Freshmen; Comparative Analysis; Females; Higher Education; Institutional Research; Males; *Racial Attitudes; Racial Discrimination; *Sex Differences; Social Environment; State Universities; *Student Attitudes; *Whites |
| IDENTIFIERS | Intimacy; Situational Attitude Scale (Sedlacek and Brooks); *University of Maryland College Park |

ABSTRACT

At the University of Maryland, College Park (UMCP), 352 white freshmen completed the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) in a study of racial attitudes. The SAS (1972) was developed to minimize the degree of subject withdrawal from the measurement of racial attitudes and to eliminate the "social set" problem that keeps subjects' real feelings hidden. The results showed generally negative attitudes about blacks, particularly in situations of black neighbors or a friend becoming engaged to a black. Women were found to be more positive towards blacks than men in situations allowing more social distance, but tended to be more negative than men in situations requiring intimate black-white contact. This same pattern of results has existed at UMCP since the late 1960s despite many changes in the social context of the campus and society, including increased racial diversity on campus. The findings indicate that whites do possess negative/racist attitudes towards blacks in a variety of situations; that the situational context does make a difference in determining attitudes; that white females do have different racial attitudes than do white males; that these differences appear to fall along a physical distance/safe-unsafe continuum. It is concluded that workshops and classes designed to eliminate racism should be funded and endorsed by all levels of administration and faculty.
(Author/LB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED208734

# COUNSELING CENTER

## Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

### UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

College Park, Maryland

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
  Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Counseling Center
Univ of MD
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

014421

RACIAL ATTITUDES OF WHITE UNIVERSITY FRESHMEN BY SEX

R. Sprott Hagberg and William E. Gilbrook

Research Report #3-70

COUNSELING CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

# RACIAL ATTITUDES OF WHITE UNIVERSITY FRESHMEN BY SEX

R. Scott Rodgers and William E. Sedlacek

Research Report # 9-79

## Summary

352 white freshmen completed the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS), with the results showing generally negative attitudes toward Blacks, particularly in situations of black neighbors and a friend becoming engaged to a Black. Women were more positive toward Blacks than men in situations allowing more social distance, but tended to be more negative than men toward situations requiring intimate contact with Blacks.

This same pattern of results has existed at University of Maryland, College Park since the late 1960's despite many changes in the social context of the campus and society. The implications of the results for the campus and suggested actions are presented and discussed.

As the racial diversity at colleges and universities has increased, the measurement of racial attitudes has become more important. This diversity has increased the likelihood of more frequent interracial interactions and hence conflicts (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1971; 1972a; 1976). Past efforts at measuring the racial attitudes of whites have shown that there was a "social set" for appearing to be tolerant or positive toward blacks (Sigal & Page, 1920). Sedlacek and Brooks (1971) found this was also true among university students.

The instrument used in the present study, the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS), (Sedlacek & Brooks, 1972a), was developed to minimize the degree of subject withdrawal from the measurement of racial attitudes, and to eliminate the "social set" problem that keeps subjects' real feelings hidden. Using the SAS, Sedlacek & Brooks found that, keeping all other conditions equal, the insertion of the work "black" in a social or personal situation resulted in different and more negative responses from white subjects than if race were not mentioned. Another finding of studies using the SAS was that the reaction of the subjects depended upon the particular situation under consideration (Sedlacek & Brooks, 1972b). For instance, in situations where blacks were portrayed in non-intimate, social-service type roles, whites showed more positive attitudes than if no race were mentioned. Other situations produced different results (Sedlacek & Brooks, 1970a,b; Brooks & Sedlacek, 1972a). In other words, each of the 10 situations presented in the SAS was relatively independent of the others; and this is an indication of the complexity of racial attitude measurement and the importance of considering the situational context (Sedlacek & Brooks, 1970a,b,c; Brooks & Sedlacek, 1970, 1971; Brooks, Sedlacek & Chapels 1974, Sedlacek, & Brooks 1972, Chapels, Sedlacek & Miyares 1978, Forrer, Sedlacek & Agarie 1977).

Research investigating racial attitudes also attempted to determine if there were any racial attitude differences between the sexes. Early studies comparing the racial attitudes of white males and females produced confusing results. Some studies concluded that white females have more negative attitudes toward blacks than do white males (Bogardus, 1959; Proenza & Strickland, 1965), others indicated more positive attitudes toward blacks (Stein, 1966; Creager, 1971) and still others found no significant differences between the racial attitudes of white females and males (Bogardus, 1959; Sheatsley, 1966; Greeley & Sheatsley, 1971)

Since these studies used different methods to measure racial attitudes, the mixed results were not surprising. Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a, 1972a) discussed the methodological problems confronting the researcher of racial attitudes. Briefly, the important issues were: a) lack of contemporary content in existing measures, b) lack of validity information for the measurement scales, and c) inadequate assessment techniques to measure social reinforcement for being tolerant or positive toward blacks (Sedlacek & Brooks, 1972a). The use of the SAS appeared to have overcome these problems, while at the same time it helped to point out the extremely complex nature of racial attitudes.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between sex and racial attitudes in a controlled study.

## METHOD

### Instrument

The Situational Attitude Scale (SAS), developed by Sedlacek and Brooks (1972b, 1970a,b), was used in the current study. The SAS contains 10 social or personal situations where race may be a variable (see Table 1). Ten bipolar, semantic differential scales (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957) were

provided for each situation (see Table 2). Two forms of the SAS were administered . Each form contained the same situations with exactly the same wording, except that the word "black" was inserted into the situations in Form B (see Table 1). Form A made no mention of race. The positive and negative pole of each item was varied randomly to control for any response-set phonomenon.

Subjects

The SAS was administered to 352 white freshmen entering the University of Maryland, College Park. The two forms of the instrument were distributed randomly, so that each subject had an approximately equal chance of receiving either Form A or B.

Analyses

The data were analyzed by analysis of variance at the .05 level for each item, with Form (A or B) and Sex (male or female) as main effects.

## RESULTS

Demographics of the Sample

Fifty-one percent of the sample were males; the majority (55%) reported they were 18 years old. The three major religious groups were evenly represented, with 30% reporting they were Catholic, 26% Jewish, and 23% Protestant. The majority of the students' fathers were either employed as professional (46%) or semi-professional (38%) full time workers, while the mothers were more evenly divided between sales/clerical (34%), semi professional (28%) and professional (23%), and between full (58%) and part time (42%) employment.

Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations for each subgroup with significant F tests for each item. Results indicated that 45 out of the 100

items were significantly different (at .05) on Form, 44 were significant on Sex, and 10 were significant on the interaction of Form and Sex. Sakoda, Cohen and Beall (1954) indicated that in doing this type of analysis, one should expect only 9 out of 100 items to be significant at the .05 level by chance. The two main effects were thus highly significant, while the interaction was about at the chance level.

Form

On Form, students indicated more negative attitudes toward blacks on 8 out of the 10 situations. The 2 situations where the most negative attitudes were reported were Situations I (new family next door) and V (friend becomes engaged).

There were two situations where whites indicated generally positive attitudes toward blacks. These were situations III (man selling magazines) and VI (stopped by a policeman). Whites responded more positively when these situations involved blacks, more so than if there were no mention of race at all.

Sex

Irrespective of Form, females, in general, appeared to hold more positive attitudes than males on situation I (new family next door), V (friend becomes engaged), VI (stopped by a policeman), VII (person joins social group), VIII (youngster steals) and IX (campus demonstration).

Females had more negative attitudes than males on situations II (man raped woman), III (man selling magazines) and IV (corner of loitering men).

Interaction, Form by Sex

Table 2 shows the nine significant Form by Sex interactions. The interaction effects seemed to form three kinds of groupings: 1 - where females

responded more positively than males on Form A, and where both males and females were similar on Form B, Situations I (family moves next door) and VII (personsjoins social group); 2 - where females responded more negatively on Form A than males, and where both males and females were similar on Form B, Situations II (man raped women) and VI (stopped by a policeman); and 3 - where females reacted more positively on Form B than males, and where males and females were similar on Form A, Situation IX (campus demonstration).

## DISCUSSION

The results show that whites, in general, responded more negatively to situations in which blacks are considered. This held true especially for the more physically close and intimate situations of a black family moving next door and a friend becoming engaged to a black. These results were consistant with past research findings (Sedlacek & Brooks, 1972a, 1970a, 1972b; Brooks & Sedlacek, 1970, 1971). Another consistent finding is that whites appeared to respond more favorably to blacks when blacks are in socially acceptable, safe roles such as magazine salesman or policeman, than if race were not mentioned.

When the results were considered differentially by sex, a richer picture was presented. Females, as a group were seen as being more "open" than males, as evidenced by their more positive attitudes on several of the more social and less intimate items (situations I, VII, IX). At the same time, females were more negative in their responses to situations that could possibly offer physical harm (situations II, III, IV). This conclusion was similar to previous research (Sedlacek & Brooks, 1972a, 1970a, 1972b; Brooks & Sedlacek 1970, 1971). The findings of this report, however, did not substantiate a conclusion arrived at by Sedlacek & Brooks (1972a) on situation II (man raped woman). Those researchers found that females reacted more strongly (negatively) to the situation on Form B (when a black raped a woman). The data of this study indicate that women were reacting more to the act itself than to the race of the person committing the rape. It may be that the intensity of this type of situation was such that it masked any differential effects of race for females, or it may be that the heightened consciousness of the nature of rape which has occurred over the past few years has resulted in a negative response to the act of rape, regardless of the circumstances surrounding it. It is interesting to note that while males responded with more negative racial

attitudes toward blacks, it was the females who showed more mean score variation across situations and forms. For the most part, the variations existed on Form A, except on situation IX (campus demonstration). Here females responsed more positively to the situation when blacks were considered (Form B). This is the most distant of the situations, and one in which Blacks might be considered as a group entitled to rights and freedoms, but also less personally threatening than if your friend got engaged, or even if you bought magazines from a black.

The findings of this study, while differing slightly from past studies (Sedlacek & Brooks 1972a, 1972b, 1970a; Brooks & Sedlacek 1970, 1971) using the SAS with similar samples, were still consistant with their major findings: 1) Whites do possess negative/racist attitudes toward blacks in a variety of situations; 2) the situational context does make a difference in determining atitudes; 3) white females do have different racial attitudes than do white males; and 4) these differences appeared to fall along a physical distance/-safe-unsafe continuum.

The problem of racism at a large university is aided by research of this kind. That white students have not changed their basic negative attitudes toward blacks since they were first studied at UMCP in the late 1960's is sobering. There is still a great need for research on overt-behavior; studies like this one deal only with expressed feelings. It has not yet been shown that we can predict what a person will do based on his written attitude scores. It is also true that research is not enough. Implementation of what we already know is possible (Sedlacek & Brooks 1976). Workshops and classes open to all students should be funded and endorsed by all levels of administration and faculty. Racism is a pervasive and persistant problem. The only way to modify our attitudes and behavior is to start to work on the problem, and keep working at it until the problem is solved.

TABLE 2

Means *, Standard Deviations, and Results of Analyses of Variance

| Item No. | SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION | Male Form A(N=92) Mean | Male Form A(N=92) S.D. | Male Form B(N=72) Mean | Male Form B(N=72) S.D. | Female Form A(N=70) Mean | Female Form A(N=70) S.D. | Female Form B(N=90) Mean | Female Form B(N=90) S.D. | Differences Significant At .05*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | I. NEW FAMILY NEXT DOOR | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | good - bad | 1.29 | .80 | 1.94 | .98 | .81 | .80 | 1.74 | .93 | S,F |
| 2. | safe - unsafe | 1.42 | .81 | 1.49 | 1.02 | 1.21 | .91 | 1.52 | 1.07 | |
| 3. | angry - not angry | 3.21 | .94 | 2.90 | 1.08 | 3.57 | .67 | 2.89 | 1.09 | F |
| 4. | friendly - unfriendly | .78 | .91 | 1.15 | 1.03 | .66 | .72 | 1.02 | .98 | F |
| 5. | sympathetic - not sympathetic | 1.85 | 1.05 | 2.37 | 1.01 | 1.94 | 1.13 | 2.39 | 1.14 | F |
| 6. | nervous - calm | 2.48 | 1.18 | 2.49 | 1.14 | 2.41 | 1.21 | 2.61 | 1.20 | |
| 7. | happy - sad | 1.51 | .76 | 2.01 | .78 | 1.00 | .90 | 1.90 | .87 | S,F,FxS |
| 8. | objectionable - acceptable | 2.79 | .94 | 2.69 | 1.26 | 3.10 | 1.05 | 2.88 | 1.18 | |
| 9. | desirable - undesirable | 1.70 | .69 | 2.06 | .99 | 1.27 | .81 | 2.00 | .97 | S,FxS |
| 10. | suspicious - trusting | 2.34 | .90 | 2.43 | 1.02 | 2.74 | .94 | 2.41 | 1.04 | FxS |
| | II. MAN RAPED WOMAN | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. | affection - disgust | 3.51 | .83 | 3.74 | .53 | 3.77 | .46 | 3.81 | .47 | S,F |
| 12. | relish - repulsion | 3.39 | .82 | 3.57 | .71 | 3.74 | .50 | 3.67 | .64 | S |
| 13. | happy - sad | 3.29 | .88 | 3.57 | .65 | 3.78 | .48 | 3.79 | .48 | S |
| 14. | friendly - hostile | 3.02 | .77 | 3.33 | .79 | 3.40 | .77 | 3.31 | .84 | S,FxS |
| 15. | uninvolved - involved | 1.36 | 1.20 | 1.79 | 1.06 | 1.81 | 1.17 | 1.74 | 1.19 | |
| 16. | hope - hopelessness | 2.06 | .99 | 2.42 | .96 | 2.53 | 1.14 | 2.54 | .85 | S,F |
| 17. | aloof - outraged | 2.76 | .92 | 2.78 | 1.02 | 3.08 | .81 | 2.88 | 1.02 | |
| 18. | injure - kill | 1.80 | 1.15 | 1.75 | 1.11 | 1.67 | 1.19 | 1.87 | 1.19 | |
| 19. | safe - fearful | 1.93 | 1.08 | 2.28 | 1.12 | 3.27 | .83 | 3.14 | .88 | S,FxS |
| 20. | empathetic - can't understand | 2.42 | 1.18 | 2.82 | 1.12 | 2.63 | 1.32 | 3.00 | 1.08 | F |

*Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent 0 to 4).

**See Table 1 for complete situation.

***Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (form A or B) and S (Sex, Male or Female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction.

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Means *, Standard Deviations, and Results of Analyses of Variance

| Item No. | SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION | Male Form A(N=92) Mean | Male Form A(N=92) S.D. | Male Form B(N=72) Mean | Male Form B(N=72) S.D. | Female Form A(N=70) Mean | Female Form A(N=70) S.D. | Female Form B(N=90) Mean | Female Form B(N=90) S.D. | Differences Significant At .05*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | III. MAN SELLING MAGAZINES | | | | | | | | | |
| 21. | relaxed - startled | 2.17 | 1.06 | 1.97 | 1.28 | 2.63 | 1.05 | 2.61 | 1.19 | S |
| 22. | receptive - cautious | 3.06 | .82 | 2.55 | 1.19 | 3.45 | .72 | 3.07 | 1.02 | S,F |
| 23. | excited - unexcited | 3.04 | 1.00 | 2.61 | 1.01 | 2.88 | 1.11 | 2.91 | 1.20 | |
| 24. | glad - angered | 2.44 | .70 | 2.17 | .60 | 2.43 | .64 | 2.28 | .60 | F |
| 25. | pleased - annoyed | 2.79 | .87 | 2.47 | .80 | 2.71 | .92 | 2.77 | .85 | |
| 26. | indifferent - suspicious | 2.28 | 1.24 | 2.12 | 1.28 | 2.63 | 1.22 | 2.58 | 1.32 | S |
| 27. | tolerable - intolerable | 1.84 | 1.03 | 1.65 | 1.08 | 1.94 | 1.09 | 1.82 | 1.09 | |
| 28. | afraid - secure | 2.23 | .93 | 2.29 | 1.07 | 1.44 | 1.05 | 1.39 | 1.05 | S |
| 29. | friend - enemy | 2.02 | .66 | 1.99 | .78 | 2.17 | .70 | 2.15 | .70 | S |
| 30. | unprotected - protected | 2.48 | .89 | 2.39 | .93 | 1.81 | 1.08 | 1.53 | 1.12 | S |
| | IV. CORNER OF LOITERING MEN | | | | | | | | | |
| 31. | relaxed - tense | 2.90 | .93 | 3.07 | 1.04 | 3.36 | .98 | 3.49 | .82 | S |
| 32. | pleased - angered | 2.24 | .50 | 2.28 | .61 | 2.47 | .76 | 2.62 | .83 | S |
| 33. | superior - inferior | 2.16 | 1.05 | 2.25 | 1.07 | 2.61 | 1.07 | 2.33 | 1.07 | S |
| 34. | smarter - dumber | 1.21 | .83 | 1.29 | .78 | 1.68 | .96 | 1.57 | .87 | S |
| 35. | whiter - blacker | 1.51 | .87 | .87 | .99 | 1.58 | .93 | .93 | 1.04 | F |
| 36. | aggressive - passive | 2.05 | 1.17 | 2.42 | 1.04 | 2.56 | 1.07 | 2.47 | 1.00 | S |
| 37. | safe - unsafe | 2.44 | 1.04 | 2.67 | .99 | 3.00 | .95 | 3.22 | .87 | S,F |
| 38. | friendly - unfriendly | 2.12 | .92 | 1.99 | 1.07 | 2.50 | 1.11 | 2.42 | 1.02 | S |
| 39. | excited - unexcited | 2.00 | .99 | 2.12 | .99 | 2.21 | 1.11 | 2.30 | 1.11 | S |
| 40. | trivial - important | 1.63 | 1.00 | 1.76 | 1.01 | 1.90 | 1.14 | 2.08 | 1.16 | S |

*Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent 0 to 4).
**See Table 1 for complete situation.
***Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (form A or B) and S (Sex, Male or Female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction.

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Means *, Standard Deviations, and Results of Analyses of Variance

| Item No. | SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION | Male Form A(N=92) Mean | Male Form A(N=92) S.D. | Male Form B(N=72) Mean | Male Form B(N=72) S.D. | Female Form A(N=70) Mean | Female Form A(N=70) S.D. | Female Form B(N=90) Mean | Female Form B(N=90) S.D. | Differences Significant At .05*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | V. FRIEND BECOMES ENGAGED | | | | | | | | | |
| 41. | aggressive - passive | 2.05 | 1.13 | 2.35 | 1.26 | 1.74 | 1.21 | 2.31 | 1.21 | F |
| 42. | happy - sad | .69 | 1.01 | 1.69 | 1.32 | .51 | .99 | 1.82 | 1.32 | F |
| 43. | tolerable - intolerable | .70 | .94 | 1.30 | 1.35 | .66 | .98 | 1.04 | 1.07 | F |
| 44. | complimented - insulted | 1.26 | .99 | 2.00 | 1.03 | 1.11 | 1.01 | 1.82 | .83 | F |
| 45. | angered - overjoyed | 3.02 | .95 | 2.08 | 1.04 | 3.24 | 1.09 | 2.13 | 1.03 | F |
| 46. | secure - fearful | 1.30 | 1.01 | 1.36 | 1.10 | 1.20 | 1.08 | 1.49 | 1.13 | |
| 47. | hopeful - hopeless | .83 | .97 | 1.67 | 1.11 | .71 | 1.02 | 1.42 | 1.22 | F |
| 48. | excited - unexcited | 1.03 | .94 | 1.90 | 1.21 | .38 | .78 | 7.69 | 1.20 | S,F |
| 49. | right - wrong | 1.27 | 1.02 | 1.99 | 1.30 | 1.16 | 1.08 | 2.03 | 1.27 | F |
| 50. | disgusting - pleasing | 3.06 | .96 | 2.05 | 1.22 | 3.44 | .96 | 2.13 | 1.12 | F |
| | VI. STOPPED BY POLICEMAN | | | | | | | | | |
| 51. | calm - nervous | 3.09 | 1.21 | 2.49 | 1.41 | 3.54 | .79 | 2.33 | 1.54 | F,FxS |
| 52. | trusting - suspicious | 1.99 | 1.17 | 1.24 | 1.19 | 1.81 | 1.32 | 1.03 | 1.14 | F |
| 53. | afraid - safe | 1.58 | 1.26 | 2.62 | 1.91 | 1.16 | 1.31 | 2.53 | 1.41 | F |
| 54. | friendly - unfriendly | 1.43 | 1.25 | 1.39 | 1.06 | 1.17 | 1.14 | 1.04 | 1.07 | |
| 55. | tolerant - intolerant | 1.13 | 1.21 | .97 | 1.07 | 1.04 | 1.11 | .77 | 1.02 | |
| 56. | bitter - pleasant | 1.75 | 1.25 | 2.29 | 1.14 | 2.17 | 1.41 | 2.28 | 1.21 | F |
| 57. | cooperative - uncooperative | .61 | .96 | .61 | .91 | .38 | .86 | .35 | .75 | S |
| 58. | acceptable - tilligerent | 1.08 | 1.06 | .94 | 1.09 | .87 | .96 | .78 | 1.01 | |
| 59. | inferior - superior | 1.35 | .91 | 1.86 | .91 | 1.20 | .99 | 1.64 | .84 | F |
| 60. | smarter - dumber | 2.15 | .96 | 1.80 | .76 | 2.35 | .90 | 2.14 | .70 | S,F |

*Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent 0 to 4).
**See Table 1 for complete situation.
***Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (form A or B) and S (Sex, Male or Female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction.

TABLE 2

Means *, Standard Deviations, and Results of Analyses of Variance

| Item No. | SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION | Male | | | | Female | | | | Differences Significant At .05*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Form A(N=92) | | Form B(N=72) | | Form A(N=70) | | Form B(N=90) | | |
| | | Mean | S.D. | Mean | S.D. | Mean | S.D. | Mean | S.D. | |
| | VII. PERSON JOINS SOCIAL GROUP | | | | | | | | | |
| 61. | warm - cold | 1.21 | 1.04 | 1.24 | 1.17 | .68 | .92 | .98 | .97 | S |
| 62. | sad - happy | 2.78 | .84 | 2.62 | 1.03 | 3.31 | .77 | 2.69 | .97 | S,F,FxS |
| 63. | superior - inferior | 1.47 | .88 | 1.82 | .68 | 1.43 | .81 | 1.72 | .60 | F |
| 64. | threatened - neutral | 2.75 | 1.28 | 3.14 | 1.06 | 2.83 | 1.30 | 3.28 | 1.03 | F |
| 65. | pleased - displeased | 1.30 | .97 | 1.53 | 1.07 | .76 | .98 | 1.31 | 1.03 | S,F |
| 66. | understanding - indifferent | 1.31 | 1.19 | 1.65 | 1.28 | .67 | .88 | 1.41 | 1.31 | S,F |
| 67. | suspicious - trusting | 2.29 | .92 | 2.57 | 1.10 | 2.78 | 1.00 | 2.69 | 1.07 | S |
| 68. | disappointed - elated | 2.28 | .73 | 2.14 | .91 | 2.74 | .73 | 2.22 | .75 | S,F,FxS |
| 69. | favorable - unfavorable | 1.40 | .85 | 1.60 | 1.09 | .83 | .83 | 1.33 | 1.11 | S,F |
| 70. | uncomfortable - comfortable | 2.50 | 1.00 | 2.44 | 1.18 | 2.73 | 1.06 | 2.65 | 1.25 | |
| | VIII. YOUNGSTER STEALS | | | | | | | | | |
| 71. | surprising - not surprising | 2.28 | 1.47 | 2.55 | 1.15 | 2.04 | 1.60 | 2.37 | 1.38 | |
| 72. | sad - happy | .98 | .80 | 1.18 | 1.02 | .51 | .72 | .54 | .81 | S |
| 73. | disinterested - interested | 2.37 | 1.21 | 2.07 | 1.25 | 3.00 | 1.09 | 2.44 | 1.23 | S,F |
| 74. | close - distant | 2.31 | 1.18 | 2.49 | .98 | 2.24 | 1.31 | 2.51 | 1.12 | |
| 75. | understandable - baffling | 2.01 | 1.18 | 1.90 | 1.16 | 2.60 | 1.17 | 2.04 | 1.13 | S,F |
| 76. | responsible - not responsible | 2.65 | 1.29 | 2.99 | 1.19 | 2.33 | 1.45 | 2.69 | 1.18 | F |
| 77. | concerned - unconcerned | 1.43 | 1.21 | 1.86 | 1.21 | .81 | .97 | 1.15 | 1.01 | S,F |
| 78. | sympathy - indifference | 1.77 | 1.18 | 2.47 | 1.22 | 1.43 | .96 | 1.79 | 1.21 | S,F |
| 79. | expected - unexpected | 2.22 | 1.01 | 1.96 | 1.01 | 2.21 | 1.14 | 1.91 | 1.01 | F |
| 80. | hopeful - hopeless | 1.94 | 1.12 | 2.21 | .93 | 2.20 | 1.08 | 1.85 | 1.08 | FxS |

*Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent 0 to 4).

**See Table 1 for complete situation.

***Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (form A or B) and S (Sex, Male or Female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction.

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Means *, Standard Deviations, and Results of Analyses of Variance

| Item No. | SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION | Male Form A(N=92) Mean | Male Form A(N=92) S.D. | Male Form B(N=72) Mean | Male Form B(N=72) S.D. | Female Form A(N=70) Mean | Female Form A(N=70) S.D. | Female Form B(N=90) Mean | Female Form B(N=90) S.D. | Differences Significant At .05*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | IX. CAMPUS DEMONSTRATION | | | | | | | | | |
| 81. | bad - good | 2.16 | .92 | 1.61 | 1.00 | 2.43 | .99 | 2.10 | 1.04 | S,F |
| 82. | understanding - indifferent | 1.68 | 1.06 | 2.08 | 1.24 | 1.46 | 1.20 | 1.67 | 1.23 | S,F |
| 83. | suspicious - trusting | 1.78 | .92 | 1.76 | .89 | 2.11 | .86 | 2.14 | .92 | S |
| 84. | safe - unsafe | 1.91 | .87 | 2.12 | .95 | 1.84 | 1.01 | 1.91 | 1.04 | |
| 85. | disturbed - undisturbed | 1.90 | .95 | 1.92 | 1.15 | 2.11 | 1.09 | 1.81 | 1.18 | |
| 86. | justified - unjustified | 1.61 | .78 | 1.93 | 1.04 | 1.56 | .84 | 1.53 | .93 | S |
| 87. | tense - calm | 2.09 | 1.06 | 1.93 | 1.02 | 2.14 | 1.08 | 1.93 | 1 08 | |
| 88. | hate - love | 2.12 | .63 | 1.97 | .69 | 2.10 | .68 | 2.08 | .62 | |
| 89. | wrong - right | 2.33 | .71 | 1.92 | .82 | 2.31 | .88 | 2.31 | .89 | F,FxS |
| 90. | humorous - serious | 2.25 | 1.05 | 2.46 | 1.02 | 2.64 | .95 | 2.83 | .89 | S |
| | X. ONLY PERSON STANDING | | | | | | | | | |
| 91. | fearful - secure | 2.35 | 1.17 | 1.54 | 1.12 | 2.13 | 1.27 | 1.42 | 1.24 | F |
| 92. | tolerable - intolerable | 1.51 | 1.24 | 1.60 | 1.28 | 1.27 | 1.18 | 1.62 | 1.24 | |
| 93. | hostile - indifferent | 2.72 | 1.15 | 2.69 | 1.21 | 2.97 | 1.18 | 2.60 | 1.06 | |
| 94. | important - trivial | 2.68 | 1.20 | 2.49 | 1.16 | 3.00 | 1.10 | 2.53 | 1.11 | F |
| 95. | conspicious - inconspicious | 1.30 | 1.25 | 1.22 | 1.22 | 1.23 | 1.19 | 1.15 | 1.23 | |
| 96. | calm - anxious | 1.89 | 1.43 | 2.15 | 1.37 | 1.91 | 1.31 | 2.50 | 1.27 | F |
| 97. | indignant - understanding | 2.51 | 1.17 | 2.36 | 1.09 | 2.70 | 1.04 | 2.37 | 1.12 | |
| 98. | comfortable - uncomfortable | 2.47 | 1.26 | 2.61 | 1.26 | 2.46 | 1.35 | 2.87 | 1.24 | |
| 99. | hate - love | 1.98 | .77 | 1.85 | .74 | 2.01 | .65 | 1.95 | .68 | |
| 100. | not resentful - resentful | 1.42 | 1.21 | 1.43 | 1.31 | 1.23 | 1.23 | 1.53 | 1.17 | |

*Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent 0 to 4).
**See Table 1 for complete situation.
***Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (form A or B) and S (Sex, Male or Female) as main effects and F x S as the interaction.